

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application; claims 8-20 are newly added.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s), and for determining that the drawings are acceptable.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. The claims are not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added.

The Office action asserts that the application does not contain an abstract on a separate sheet. The applicants respectfully note that the application was originally filed as a PCT application, and included an abstract on a separate sheet. The applicants have no control over how the International Bureau communicates the application to the receiving Office. The applicants further note that the publication of this application, USPA 2006/0126887, clearly demonstrates that an Abstract has been received by the USPTO. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution of this application, the applicants have included a replacement amendment on a separate sheet as requested in the Office action.

The Office action rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Rhoads et al. (USP 7,050,603, hereinafter Rhoads). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A rejection under U.S.C. 102(b) is proper only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." **MPEP 2131.** "There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." **BPAI Opinion No. 2005-2289, October 2005.**

Rhoads fails to teach examining a video signal being applied to a display screen to locate image areas in which the video signal changes from frame to frame, defining a bounding box around the image areas to provide an area of interest, and detecting a watermark in the area of interest, as specifically claimed in each of the applicants' independent claims.

The Office action asserts that Rhoads teaches examining a video signal being applied to a display screen to locate image areas in which the video signal changes from frame to frame at column 6, lines 15-21. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. At the cited text, Rhoads teaches:

"The screen location selected by the user determines which identifier is sent to the server for linked information or actions. In other words, a process at the end-user side maps the location of the user selection to an identifier based on the locations encoded along with the identifiers in the content. For example, a segment of the audio track that is intended to be played with a corresponding video frame or frame sequence may include a watermark or watermarks that carry one or more pairs of identifier and locations." (Rhoades, column 6, lines 12-21.)

The cited text of Rhoades does not address examining a video signal, and does not address examining a video signal being applied to a display, and does not address locating image areas in which the video changes. Thus, it is clearly evident that the cited text does not provide support for the assertion that Rhoads teaches examining a video signal being applied to a display screen to locate image areas in which the video signal changes from frame to frame.

The Office action asserts that Rhoads teaches defining a bounding box around the image areas to provide an area of interest, and detecting a watermark within this area of interest at column 6, lines 25-29. The applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. At the cited text, Rhoads teaches:

"Then, in the decoding process, the identifier closest to the location of the user interaction is used. A modification includes providing bounding locations in the watermark and determining whether the user's selection is within this area, as opposed to using the closest watermark location to the user's selection." (Rhoads, column 6, lines 25-26.)

The cited text of Rhoades clearly states that the bounding locations for determining whether a user selection is within the bounded area are contained in the watermark. That is, the watermark must be detected and decoded in order to determine the bounding locations. The bounding locations define an area for detecting a user selection, and do not define an area for detecting the watermark. Thus, it is clearly evident that the cited text does not provide support for the assertion that Rhoads teaches defining a bounding box around the image areas to provide an area of interest, and detecting a watermark within this area of interest.

Because Rhoads fails to teach each of the elements of the applicants' independent claims, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Rhoads should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/  
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.  
Reg. 41,508  
804-493-0707

**Please direct all correspondence to:**  
Corporate Counsel  
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001